arXiv:math/0702142v2 [math.AC] 15 Nov 2007

NOTE ON STAR OPERATIONS OVER POLYNOMIAL RINGS

A. MIMOUNI

Abstract. This paper studies the notions of star and semistar operations over a polynomial ring. It aims at characterizing when every upper to zero in $R[X]$ is a $*$-maximal ideal and when a $*$-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ is extended from R, that is, $Q=(Q\cap R)[X]$ with $Q\cap R\neq 0$, for a given star operation of finite character $*$ on $R[X]$. We also answer negatively some questions raised by Anderson-Clarke by constructing a Prüfer domain R for which the v-operation is not stable.

1. Introduction

Star operations, such as the t-closure, the w-closure and the v-closure (or divisorial closure) are an essential tool in modern multiplicative ideal theory for characterizing and investigating several classes of integral domains. For an integral domain R with quotient field K, if $f\in K[X]$ is an irreducible polynomial, then we call the prime ideal $P=fK[X]\cap R[X]$ an upper to zero. Uppers to zero have been used by many authors to characterize ring-theoretic properties. For example, a domain R is Prüfer if and only if $P\nsubseteq M[X]$ for each upper to zero P in $R[X]$ and each maximal ideal M of R, [16, Theorem 19.15]. A corresponding result exists for Prüfer v-multiplication domains ($PvMD$s). A domain R is a $PvMD$ if and only if R is an integrally closed UMT-domain, [13, Proposition 2.6]. UMT-domains, that is, domains R such that every upper to zero in the polynomial ring $R[X]$ is t-maximal were introduced in [14] and studied in [5], [6], [7] and investigated in greater detail in [8]. Recently, E. Houston and M. Zafrullah introduced and studied the notion of UMV-domains, that is, domains R such that every upper to zero in $R[X]$ is a maximal divisorial ideal ([15]). Also it is well-known that for each nonzero fractional ideal I of R, $(I[X])_t=I_t[X]$, $(I[X])_v=I_v[X]$ and $(I[X])_w=I_w[X]$ ([12, Proposition 4.3] and every t-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ such that $Q\cap R=q\neq 0$ is of the form $Q=q[X]$ ([14, Proposition 1.1]. The purpose of this note is to study when uppers to zero are $*$-maximal ideals and when $Q=(Q\cap R)[X]$ for a $*$-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ with $Q\cap R\neq 0$, for a given star operation of finite character $*$ on $R[X]$. Our main results assert that for a domain R and a star operation of finite character $*$ on $R[X]$, every upper to zero is $*$-maximal if and only if R is a UMT-domain and t-Max(R[X])=$*$-Max(R[X]) (Theorem 2.9). Also for a $*$-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ with $Q\cap R\neq 0$, $Q=(Q\cap R)[X]$ if and only if $c(Q)^{\bar{*}}\subsetneq R$ if and only if $c(g)^{\bar{*}}\subsetneq R$ for each $g\in Q$, where $\bar{*}$ is the star operation of finite character on R induced by $*$ (Proposition 2.3). This characterization leads us to construct a star operation of finite character $*$ on $R[X]$ such that $(Q\cap R)[X]\subsetneq Q$ for some $*$-maximal ideal Q of

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13A15, 13F20, 13B25; Secondary 13F05, 13G05.

Key words and phrases. star operation, semistar operation, $*$-ideal, upper to zero, $*$-maximal, UMT-domain.

$R[X]$ with $Q\cap R\neq 0$. We close this note by answering negatively some questions cited in [1]. Precisely, we construct a Prüfer domain R such that the v-operation on R is not stable.

Throughout R is an integral domain with quotient field K, $\bar{F}(R)$ denotes the set of all nonzero R-submodules of K, $F(R)$ denotes the set of all nonzero fractional ideals of R, i. e., $E\in F(R)$ if $E\in\bar{F}(R)$ and $dE\subseteq R$ for some $0\neq d\in R$ and $f(R)$ the set of all nonzero finitely generated R-submodules of K. A semistar operation on R is a map $*:\bar{F}(R)\longrightarrow\bar{F}(R), E\mapsto E^*$ satisfying the following properties for each $E,F\in\bar{F}(R)$ and each $0\neq a\in K$:
$(*_1)$ $(aE)^*=aE^*$;
$(*_2)$ $E\subseteq E^*$ and if $E\subseteq F$, then $E^*\subseteq F^*$;
$(*_3)$ $E^{**}=E^*$.
In the particular case where $R^*=R$, we say that $*|_{F(R)}$ is a star operation on R. A semistar operation $*$ on R is said to be of finite character (or of finite type) if $E^*=\bigcup\{F^*/F\in f(R), F\subseteq E\}$. If $*$ is a semistar operation on R, the map $*_f:\bar{F}(R)\longrightarrow\bar{F}(R), E\mapsto E^{*_f}:=\bigcup\{F^*/F\in f(R), F\subseteq E\}$ is a semistar operation of finite character on R called the semistar operation of finite character associated to $*$. Obviously, $*$ is of finite character if and only if $*=*_f$. A nonzero ideal I is said to be a $*$-ideal if $I=I^*$ and a $*$-prime ideal is a prime ideal which is a $*$-ideal. It's well-known that if $*$ is a star operation of finite character and I is an integral $*$-ideal, then I is contained in a $*$-prime ideal and a minimal prime ideal over a $*$-ideal is a $*$-prime ideal. We recall that the v-operation is the largest star operation on R and the t-operation is the largest star operation of finite character on R. Finally, we use the notation $*$-Max(R) to denote the set of all $*$-maximal ideals of R, that is, $*$-prime ideals of R maximal with respect to inclusion, and for a nonzero polynomial $f\in R[X]$, $c(f)$ is the content of f, that is, the ideal of R generated by all coefficients of f.

2. Main results

We start with the following proposition showing that every semistar operation $*$ on the polynomial ring $R[X]$ induces a semistar operation on R. We often refer to it as $\bar{*}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let R be an integral domain, X an indeterminate over R and $*$ a semistar operation on $R[X]$. Then the map $\bar{*}:\bar{F}(R)\to\bar{F}(R), E\mapsto E^{\bar{*}}=(E[X])^*\cap K$ is a semistar operation on R and $I[X]^*=(I^{\bar{*}}[X])^*$ for each nonzero fractional ideal I of R. Moreover, if $*$ is of finite character, then so is $\bar{*}$.*

Proof. Most of the verification that $\bar{*}$ is a semistar operation is routine. We consider $(*_3)$. Thus, let $E\in\bar{F}(R)$. Then $E^{\bar{*}}[X]=(E[X]^*\cap K)[X]=E[X]^*[X]\cap K[X]=E[X]^*\cap K[X]\subseteq E[X]^*$. Hence $E[X]\subseteq E^{\bar{*}}[X]\subseteq E[X]^*$. So $E[X]^*\subseteq E^{\bar{*}}[X]^*\subseteq E[X]^{**}=E[X]^*$. Hence $E[X]^*=E^{\bar{*}}[X]^*$, and $E^{\bar{*}\bar{*}}=E^{\bar{*}}[X]^*\cap K=E[X]^*\cap K=E^{\bar{*}}$. It follows that $\bar{*}$ is a semistar operation on R.

Now, Let I be a nonzero fractional ideal of R. By the proof of $(*_3)$, $I[X]^*=(I^{\bar{*}}[X])^*$.

Assume that $*$ is of finite character. Let $E \in \bar{F}(R)$ and let $x \in E^{\bar{*}}$. Then $x \in E[X]^* \cap K$. Since $*$ is of finite character, then there exists a finitely generated $R[X]$-submodule F of $K(X)$ such that $F \subseteq E[X]$ and $x \in F^*$. Set $F = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} f_i R[X]$ and let $I = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} c(f_i)$. Clearly I is f.g., $I \subseteq E$ (since each $f_i \in F \subseteq E[X]$) and $x \in F^* \subseteq I[X]^*$, since $F \subseteq I[X]$. Hence $x \in I^{\bar{*}}$ and therefore $\bar{*}$ is of finite character.

Finally, if $*$ is a star operation on $R[X]$, then $R^{\bar{*}} = R[X]^* \cap K = R[X] \cap K = R$. Hence $\bar{*}|_{F(R)}$ is a star operation on R. □

Remark 2.2. If $*$ denotes the t-, respectively v-, respectively w-operation on $R[X]$, then $\bar{*}$ is the t-, respectively v-, respectively w-operation on R. Indeed, by [12, Proposition 4.3], for each $I \in F(R)$, $I^{\bar{*}} := I[X]^* \cap K = I^*[X] \cap K = I^*$.

The next proposition characterizes $*$-maximal ideals of $R[X]$ that are extended from R for a given star operation of finite character on $R[X]$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $*$ be a star operation of finite character on $R[X]$ and Q a $*$-maximal ideal of $R[X]$ such that $Q \cap R = q \neq 0$. The following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $Q = q[X]$;
(ii) $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} \subsetneq R$;
(iii) $c(g)^{\bar{*}} \subsetneq R$ for each $g \in Q$.

Proof. $(i) \Longrightarrow (ii)$. By Proposition 2.1, it is clear that $I[X]^* = R[X]$ if and only if $I^{\bar{*}} = R$. Let Q be a $*$-maximal ideal of $R[X]$. If $Q = q[X]$, then q is $\bar{*}$-prime and $c(Q) \subseteq q$. Hence $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} \subsetneq R$.
$(ii) \Longrightarrow (i)$. If $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} \subsetneq R$, then $c(Q)[X]^* \subsetneq R[X]$. Since $Q \subseteq c(Q)[X] \subseteq c(Q)[X]^*$ and Q is $*$-maximal, then $Q = c(Q)[X] = c(Q)[X]^*$. Hence $q = Q \cap R = c(Q)[X] \cap R = c(Q)$. So $Q = c(Q)[X] = q[X]$, as desired.
$(ii) \Longrightarrow (iii)$, Trivial.
$(iii) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ Suppose that $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} = R$. Since $\bar{*}$ is of finite character, then there exists a finitely generated ideal $I \subseteq c(Q)$ such that $I^{\bar{*}} = R$. So there exist polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_n \in Q$ such that $(c(f_1) + \dots + c(f_n))^{\bar{*}} = R$. Set $r_i = deg(f_i)$ and let $g = f_1 + X^{r_1+1} f_2 + X^{r_1+r_2+1} f_3 + \dots + X^{r_1+\dots+r_{n-1}+1} f_n$. Clearly $g \in Q$ and $c(g)^{\bar{*}} = R$, a contradiction. It follows that $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} \subsetneq R$. □

The next theorem is an analogue of [8, Theorem 1.1].

Theorem 2.4. *Let $*$ be a star operation of finite character on $R[X]$. Consider the following assertions:*
(i) Every upper to zero is $*$-maximal;
(ii) For every upper to zero Q in $R[X]$, $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} = R$;
(iii) For every upper to zero Q in $R[X]$, there exists $g \in Q$ such that $c(g)^{\bar{*}} = R$;
(iv) $Q \nsubseteq p[X]$ for each upper to zero Q in $R[X]$ and each $\bar{*}$-prime p of R;
(v) $Q \nsubseteq M[X]$ for each upper to zero Q in $R[X]$ and each $\bar{*}$-maximal ideal M of R.
Then $(i) \Longrightarrow (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) \Leftrightarrow (v)$. Moreover, if $*$ satisfies the conditions in

Proposition 2.3 for each $*$-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ with $Q \cap R \neq 0$, then all 5 conditions are equivalent.

Proof. $(i) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[X]$. Since $Q \subsetneq c(Q)[X]$ and Q is $*$-maximal, then $(c(Q)[X])^* = R[X]$. Hence $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} = (c(Q)[X])^* \cap K = R[X] \cap K = R$.

$(ii) \Longrightarrow (iii)$ This follows as in the proof of $(iii) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ of Proposition 2.3.

$(iii) \Longrightarrow (iv)$ Let p be a $\bar{*}$-prime ideal of R and Q an upper to zero in $R[X]$. If $Q \subseteq p[X]$, then $g \in p[X]$. Hence $R = c(g)^{\bar{*}} \subseteq p^{\bar{*}} = p$, which is absurd.

$(iv) \Longrightarrow (v)$ Trivial.

$(v) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[X]$. If $c(Q)^{\bar{*}} \subsetneq R$, then $c(Q) \subseteq M$ for some $\bar{*}$-maximal ideal M of R. Hence $Q \subseteq c(Q)[X] \subseteq M[X]$, which is absurd.

Now assume that $N = (N \cap R)[X]$ for each $N \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$ with $N \cap R \neq 0$. Under this assumption, we show that $(v) \Longrightarrow (i)$. Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[X]$. Since Q is a t-prime ideal, then Q is a $*$-ideal. So $Q \subseteq N$ for some $*$-maximal ideal N of $R[X]$. If $Q \subsetneq N$, then $M = N \cap R \neq 0$. So M is $\bar{*}$-maximal and $Q \subseteq N = M[X]$, a contradiction. Hence $Q = N$ is $*$-maximal as desired. □

Below, we give an example showing that a $*$-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ with $Q \cap R \neq 0$ need not be extended from R and hence the statements of Theorem 2.4 are not equivalent (unlike the situation in [8, Theorem 1.1]). First we need the following two propositions in which we construct a star operation of finite character that will be crucial in constructing our example.

Proposition 2.5. *Let R be an integral domain and consider the map $* : \bar{F}(R) \rightarrow \bar{F}(R), E \mapsto E^* = \bigcup\{(EJ : J) | J$ runs over the set of finitely generated fractional ideals of $R\}$. Then $*$ is a semistar operation of finite character on R. Moreover, if R is integrally closed then $*|_{F(R)}$, is a star operation of finite character on R and $*\text{-}Max(R) = Max(R)$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $* = d_a$, where d_a is the *e.a.b.* (endlich arithmetisch brauchbar) semistar operation associated to the trivial semistar operation d, [10, Definition 4.4] or [11, page 4793].

To see that $*\text{-}Max(R) = Max(R)$, let Q be a maximal ideal of R. If $Q^* = R$, then $1 \in Q^*$. So there exists a finitely generated ideal J of R such that $J \subseteq JQ$. Hence $J = JQ$ which contradicts Nakayama's lemma ([17, Theorem 76]). By maximality $Q = Q^*$. Hence Q is $*$-maximal. Conversely, if Q is $*$-maximal, then Q is prime. So $Q \subseteq M$ for some maximal ideal M of R. By the first step M is $*$-maximal. Hence $Q = M$ and therefore $*\text{-}Max(R) = Max(R)$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let R be an integrally closed domain. Denote by $*_X$ the star operation defined on $R[X]$ by $E^{*_X} = \bigcup\{(EJ : J) | J$ runs over the set of finitely generated fractional ideals of $R[X]\}$, $*_R$ the star operation defined on R by $E^{*_R} = \bigcup\{(EJ : J) | J$ runs over the set of finitely generated fractional ideals of $R\}$. Then:*

(1) *for each nonzero fractional ideal I of R, $(I[X])^{*_X} = I^{*_R}[X]$.*
(2) $\overline{*_X} = *_R$.

Proof. Let I be a nonzero fractional ideal of R and let $f \in I^{*_R}[X]$. Write $f = \sum_{i=0}^{i=n} a_iX^i$ where $a_i \in I^{*_R}$ for each i. Then for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, there exists a finitely generated ideal A_i of R such that $a_iA_i \subseteq IA_i$. Set $A = \prod_{i=0}^{i=n} A_i$. Clearly A is a finitely generated ideal of R and $a_iA \subseteq IA$ for each i. Hence $fA[X] \subseteq I[X]A[X]$ and so $f \in I[X]^{*_X}$. Then $I^{*_R}[X] \subseteq (I[X])^{*_X}$. Conversely, let $f \in (I[X])^{*_X}$. Then there exists a finitely generated ideal J of $R[X]$ such that $fJ \subseteq I[X]J$. Clearly $c(J)$ is a finitely generated ideal of R and $c(f)c(J) \subseteq Ic(J)$. Hence $c(f) \subseteq I^{*_R}$. So $f \in I^{*_R}[X]$ and therefore $(I[X])^{*_X} = I^{*_R}[X]$. Now, for each nonzero fractional ideal I of R, $I^{\overline{*_X}} := (I[X])^{*_X} \cap K = I^{*_R}[X] \cap K = I^{*_R}$. Hence $\overline{*_X} = *_R$, as desired. ☐

Example 2.7. The following example shows that:
(1) A $*$-maximal ideal Q of $R[X]$ with $Q \cap R = q \neq 0$ is not necessarily extended from R, that is, $q[X] \subsetneq Q$.
(2) The statements of Theorem 2.4 are not equivalent in general.
(3) The fact that every upper to zero in $R[X]$ is $*$-invertible is not enough to ensure that every upper to zero is $*$-maximal ([8, Theorem 1.1]).

Let k be a field and Y an indeterminate over k. Let $R = k[Y]$ and let $*_X$ be the star operation on $R[X]$ defined in Proposition 2.5. Let $Q = (X, Y)$. Then $Q \cap R = YR = q$. Since $*_X$-$Max(R[X]) = Max(R[X])$, then Q is $*_X$-maximal. However, $q[X] \subsetneq Q$.

(2) Since R is a PID, then each nonzero ideal of R is divisorial and so R has exactly one star operation which is the trivial operation d. So $\overline{*_X} = d$ and $\overline{*_X}$-$Max(R) = Max(R)$. By [16, Theorem 19.15], for every upper to zero Q in $R[X]$ and every maximal ideal M of R, $Q \nsubseteq M[X]$. However, no upper to zero Q is $*_X$-maximal since $htQ = 1$ and all maximal ideals of $R[X]$ are of height two.

(3) Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[X] = k[Y, X]$. Since $R[X]$ is a UFD and $ht(Q) = 1$, then Q is principal. Hence Q is $*_X$-invertible but not $*_X$-maximal.

The next results shed light on the relationship between $*$-$Max(R[X])$, t-$Max(R[X])$, $\bar{*}$-$Max(R)$, and t-$Max(R)$ and characterize domains for which every upper to zero in $R[X]$ is $*$-maximal for a given star operation of finite character $*$ on $R[X]$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $*$ be a star operation of finite character on $R[X]$. The following statements are equivalent:*
(i) $*$-$Max(R[X])$=t-$Max(R[X])$;
(ii) $Q_t \subsetneq R[X]$ for each $Q \in *$-$Max(R[X])$ such that $Q \cap R \neq 0$;
(iii) $\bar{*}$-$Max(R)$=t-$Max(R)$ and $Q = (Q \cap R)[X]$ for each $Q \in *$-$Max(R[X])$ with $Q \cap R \neq 0$.

Proof. $(ii) \Longrightarrow (i)$ Let $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$. If $Q \cap R = 0$, i.e. Q is an upper to zero, then Q is a t-prime ideal. So $Q \subseteq N$ for some $N \in t\text{-}Max(R[X])$. Since N is a $*$-ideal and Q is $*$-maximal, then $Q = N$. If $Q \cap R \neq 0$, by (ii), $Q_t \subsetneq R[X]$. So $Q \subseteq Q_t \subseteq N$ for some $N \in t\text{-}Max(R[X])$. Since N is a $*$-ideal and Q is $*$-maximal, then $Q = N$. Hence $*\text{-}Max(R[X]) \subseteq t\text{-}Max(R[X])$. Conversely, let $Q \in t\text{-}Max(R[X])$. Since Q is a $*$-ideal, then $Q \subseteq N$ for some $N \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$. If $N \cap R = 0$, then N is a t-ideal and since Q is t-maximal, then $Q = N$. If $N \cap R \neq 0$, by (ii), $N_t \subsetneq R[X]$. Since Q is t-maximal, then $Q = N$. Hence $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$. So $t\text{-}Max(R[X]) \subseteq *\text{-}Max(R[X])$ and therefore $*\text{-}Max(R[X]) = t\text{-}Max(R[X])$.

$(i) \Longrightarrow (iii)$ By [14, Proposition 1.1], $Q = (Q \cap R)[X]$ for each $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X]) = t\text{-}Max(R[X])$ with $Q \cap R \neq 0$. Let $p \in \bar{*}\text{-}Max(R)$. Then $(p[X])^* \subsetneq R[X]$. So there exists $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$ such that $p[X] \subseteq (p[X])^* \subseteq Q$. By (i), Q is t-maximal. Since $p \subseteq Q \cap R = q$, then $q \in t\text{-}Max(R)$ and $Q = q[X]$. Since q is a $\bar{*}$-ideal and p is $\bar{*}$-maximal, then $p = q$. Hence $p \in t\text{-}Max(R)$. Conversely, let $p \in t\text{-}Max(R)$. Since p is a $\bar{*}$-ideal, then $p \subseteq q$ for some $q \in \bar{*}\text{-}Max(R)$. Since $(q[X])^* \subsetneq R[X]$, then $(q[X])^* \subseteq Q$ for some $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X]) = t\text{-}Max(R[X])$. Since $p[X]$ is t-maximal and $p[X] \subseteq q[X] \subseteq (q[X])^* \subseteq Q$, then $p[X] = Q$. Hence $p = q \in \bar{*}\text{-}Max(R)$ and therefore $\bar{*}\text{-}Max(R) = t\text{-}Max(R)$.

$(iii) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ Let $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$ with $Q \cap R = q \neq 0$. By (ii), $Q = q[X]$ and so q is $*$-maximal. Hence q is t-maximal and therefore Q is t-maximal. So $Q_t \subsetneq R[X]$, as desired. □

Theorem 2.9. *Let $*$ be a star operation of finite character on $R[X]$. The following statements are equivalent:*
$i)$ Every upper to zero in $R[X]$ is $*$-maximal;
$ii)$ R is UMT-domain and $t\text{-}Max(R[X]) = *\text{-}Max(R[X])$.

Proof. $i) \Longrightarrow ii)$ To see that R is a UMT-domain, let Q be an upper to zero in $R[X]$. Then Q is a t-ideal. So $Q \subseteq N$ for some t-maximal ideal N of $R[X]$. Since N is a $*$-ideal and Q is $*$-maximal, then $Q = N$. Hence Q is t-maximal.
Now, let $Q \in *\text{-}Max(R[X])$ such that $Q \cap R = q \neq (0)$. Then $Q_t \subsetneq R[X]$. For if $Q_t = R[X]$, then there exists $g \in Q$ such that $c(g)_t = R$. Let P be a prime ideal of $R[X]$ such that $gR[X] \subseteq P \subseteq Q$ and P minimal over $gR[X]$. Then P is t-prime (since P is minimal over a principal ideal). Hence $P \subsetneq Q$. If $P \cap R = 0$, then P is an upper to zero. By $i)$, P is $*$-maximal and so $P = Q$, which is absurd. Hence $P \cap R = p \neq 0$. Let N be a t-maximal ideal of $R[X]$ such that $P \subseteq N$. Since $p \subseteq N \cap R = M$, then M is a t-maximal ideal of R and $N = M[X]$. Since $g \in P \subseteq N = M[X]$, then $c(g) \subseteq M$. So $R = c(g)_t \subseteq M$, which is absurd. It follows that $Q_t \subsetneq R[X]$. By Proposition 2.8, $t\text{-}Max(R[X]) = *\text{-}Max(R[X])$ as desired.
$ii) \Longrightarrow i)$ Trivial. □

We close this section with the following remark-question:

Remark 2.10. Let $*$ be a star operation of finite character on $R[X]$ such that every upper to zero is $*$-maximal. By Theorem 2.9 and [3, Corollary 2.13], it is easy to see that $w \leq * \leq t$ (here w and t are the w- and t-operation on $R[X]$). We are not able to prove or disprove if the inequalities are strict (i. e., is there a domain R

with a star operation of finite character $*$ on $R[X]$ such that every upper to zero in $R[X]$ is $*$-maximal and $w < * < t$?)

3. A Prüfer domain R for which the v-operation is not stable

We start this short section by recalling that a (semi)star operation on R is stable (respectively finite-stable) if $(A \cap B)^* = A^* \cap B^*$ for each A, B in $\bar{F}(R)$ (respectively in $f(R)$). More about star operations that distribute over finite intersection can be found in [1] and [2]. Our purpose is to answer negatively the following questions cited in [1]:

Question 3.1 ([1, Question 3.1.(1)]) Let $*$ be a star operation on a domain R.
Does $*$ finite-stable $\Longrightarrow$ $*$ is stable?

Question 3.2 ([1, Question 3.2.(2)]) Let R be an integrally closed domain.
Does v finite stable $\Longrightarrow$ v is stable?

Question 3.3 ([1, Question 3.3.(1)]) Is the v-operation stable on a Prüfer domain?

Claim The v-operation on a Prüfer domain R is finite-stable. Indeed, if A and B are finitely generated ideals of R, then A and B are invertible and so divisorial ideals. Then $A_v \cap B_v = A \cap B \subseteq (A \cap B)_v \subseteq A_v \cap B_v$. Hence $A_v \cap B_v = A \cap B = (A \cap B)_v$.

Example 3.4 Let k be a field and X, Y and Z indeterminates over k. Set $D_1 = k(X)[Y]_{(Y)}$, $D_2 = k(Y)[X]_{(X)}$ and $D = D_1 \cap D_2$. Since D_1 and D_2 are independent valuation domains of $k(X, Y)$ with maximal ideals respectively $M_1 = YD_1$ and $M_2 = XD_2$, then D is a quasilocal Prüfer domain with exactly two maximal ideals $Q_1 = M_1 \cap D$ and $Q_2 = M_2 \cap D$. Clearly $(D : D_1) = (D : D_2) = 0$. Set $V = k(X, Y)[[Z]] = k(X, Y)+M$, $R = D+M$, $A = Z(D_1+M)$ and $B = Z(D_2+M)$. Then :
$i)$ R is a Prüfer domain [4, Theorem 2.1].
(ii) Clearly $A^{-1} = B^{-1} = V$ since $(D : D_1) = (D : D_2) = 0$. Hence $A_v = B_v = M$ and so $A_v \cap B_v = M$.
(iii) $A \cap B = ZR$, so $(A \cap B)_v = ZR \subsetneq ZV = M = A_v \cap B_v$.

Acknowledgment This work is supported by KFUPM. The author would like to express his sincere thanks to the referee for his/her suggestions and comments.

References

[1] D. D. Anderson and S. M. Clarke, *When the v-operation distributes over intersections*, Comm. Algebra **34** (2006), 4327–4337.
[2] D. D. Anderson and S. M. Clarke, *Star-operations that distribute over finite intersections*, Comm. Algebra **32** (2005), 2263–2274.
[3] D. D. Anderson and S. J. Cook, *Two star-operations and their induced lattices*, Comm. Algebra **28** (5) (2000), 2461–2475.
[4] E. Bastida and R. Gilmer, *Overrings and divisorial ideals of rings of the form D+M*, Michigan Math. J. **20** (1992), 79–95.
[5] D. Dobbs, E. Houston, T. Lucas, M. Roitman and M. Zafrullah, *On t-linked overrings*, Comm. Algebra **20** (1992), 1463–1488.
[6] D. Dobbs, E. Houston, T. Lucas and M. Zafrullah, *t-linked overrings and Prüfer v-multiplication domains*, Comm. Algebra **17** (1989), 2835–2852.

[7] W. Fanggui, *On induced operations and UMT-domains*, Sichuan Shifan Daxue Xuebao Ziran Kexue Ban **27** (1) (2004), 1–9.

[8] M. Fontana, S. Gabelli and E. Houston, *UMT-Domains and Domains with Prüfer integral closure*, Comm. Algebra **26** (4) (1998), 1017–1039.

[9] M. Fontana and J. Huckaba, *Localizing systems and semistar operations*, Chapter 8, in: Chapman, S., Glaz, S., eds. Non Noetherian Commutative Ring Theory. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 169–187.

[10] M. Fontana, and K. Loper, *Kronecker function rings: a general approach*, in Ideal Theoretic Methods in Commutative Algebra" (D. D. Anderson, I. J. Papick, Eds) M. Dekker, Lecture Notes Pure Appl. Math. **220** (2001), 189–206.

[11] M. Fontana and K. Loper, *Nagata Rings, Kronecker Function Rings, and Related Semistar Operations*, Comm. Algebra **31** (10) (2003), 4775–4805.

[12] J. Hedstrom and E. Houston, *Some remarks on star-operations*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **18** (1980), 37–44.

[13] E. Houston, S. Malik and J. Mott, *Characterizations of $*$-multiplication domains*, Canad. Math. Bull. **27** (1984), 48–52.

[14] E. Houston and M. Zafrullah, *On t-invertibility II* Comm. Algebra **17** (1989), 1955–1969.

[15] E. Houston and M. Zafrullah, *UMV-domains*, Arithmetical properties of commutative rings and monoids, Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math. **241**, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, (2005), 304–315.

[16] R. Gilmer, *Multiplicative ideal theory*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 12. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1972.

[17] I. Kaplansky, *Commutative rings*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1974.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, P. O. Box 278, Dhahran 31261, Saudi Arabia

E-mail address: `amimouni@kfupm.edu.sa`